

August 11, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 11381

war in South Vietnam has always been faulty, it seems to me.

From the beginning, it has been a struggle between two authoritarian governments, each of which entertains ambitions to ultimately rule over a reunited country.

To pretend that this has been a struggle between freedom on the one hand and tyranny on the other is to assume that tyranny wears only a red cloak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. As the Senator from New York well knows, tyranny wears many cloaks. One is communism; another is the kind of military junta government that presently presides in Saigon.

I have just been reading an account of the elections in South Vietnam which appears in a recent column written by Clayton Fritchey. It is so pertinent to the subject of this debate that I should like to ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF AFFAIRS  
(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—“We are in South Vietnam today,” says President Johnson, because we want to allow a little nation self-determination. We want them to be able to go and vote for the kind of leaders they want and select the type of government they want.”

Johnson was saying in effect what Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower had said before him, which is that the U.S. is not in Vietnam to take over the country, or the war, but to help the South Vietnamese help themselves.

To that end we have unflinchingly paid an ominous price in casualties and money to save the country, to try to stabilize it, and pave the way for an election to establish a democratic, representative government which the people would support and the army would fight for.

Since everyone agrees that the war cannot be won without the loyal support of the people of South Vietnam, the election scheduled for September 3 could very well be the critical point in this long conflict. We know from sad experience that the people and the soldiers will not risk their lives for the present military government, dictatorially run by Generals Thieu and Ky. But the hope has been that all this would change once an honest election gave the people the exhilarating experience of self-government.

If, however, the military junta, in its determination to stay in power, keeps on rigging the election, it will not only have betrayed the Vietnamese, but the American people as well, for all of our sacrifices will then have been in vain.

President Johnson should long ago have warned Thieu and Ky and their fellow generals of what the public reaction in the U.S. will be if they persist in making a travesty of the election. Support for the war is already in jeopardy in the U.S. Corruption of the electoral process could be the last straw. Dr. Phan Quang Dan, who is running for Vice-President on the civilian ticket of Phan Khac Suu, says, “The prestige of Vietnam depends on this election, and so does the American support of the war.”

The Council of Republican Organizations is probably right in charging that the elections “may already have been rendered meaningless by the manipulations” of Thieu and Ky, who are heading up the military slate for President and Vice-President.

No anti-war candidates are allowed to run. The most popular general in the country (a former premier) has been exiled and ruled off the ballot. (Imagine Truman not permitting Gen. Eisenhower to return from Paris to run in 1952). Campaign news in the press is censored by and for the junta. Radio and television likewise. The chief peace candidate, Au Truong Thang, is ruled out on charges of being a Communist and neutralist even though he served in Ky's own cabinet last year as Minister of Economics. The strong trades union ticket is banned on a flimsy technicality.

The rural areas, where most of the populace lives, have been kept in darkness about the election. All candidates for the Senate must run at large instead of, as in the U.S., from their home districts. The Constitution requires “all military personnel and civil servants” to take leave of absence before seeking office but Thieu and Ky are still running the country. The Thieu-Ky combine has unlimited funds at its disposal. The civilian tickets are allowed only \$13,000 each for the whole campaign.

Not content with having virtually wrapped up victory in advance, the junta now spreads the word that it is forming a “military affairs committee” which will continue to direct national policy no matter what the voters decree. Premier Ky also warns that if any opposition ticket should win by “trickery” he will overthrow it. Trickery apparently means not voting for the generals.

Despite the degradation of the election, there has not been a murmur of protest from the U.S. government. The truth is the Johnson Administration wants the generals to win so that our puppets will appear to have democratic sanction. The last thing the Administration wants is a civilian victory which might bring to power new leaders determined to run their country independently of the U.S.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know whether it is possible for the United States to make Vietnamese elections honest and democratic, or whether, in the context of Vietnamese life and tradition, that can happen now. But to pretend that the war in Vietnam is, today, a struggle between tyranny and freedom, as we know freedom is, it seems to me, merely to convert a tragedy into a farce.

I wish that there were some answers now for the present predicament. I myself have opposed the policy of our ever-deepening involvement in Vietnam, because I believed it would lead us ultimately into this very kind of entrapment.

The Senator from New York has characterized the problem in a most exemplary way. I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Idaho. As I have traveled around the world, I have supported the commitment of the United States in South Vietnam. As the Senator from Idaho knows, I have had deep reservations about the bombing of North Vietnam and our widening commitment there. But I have said I do not believe the United States should pull out unilaterally.

I have always returned to the strongest argument that I think could be made—and I am sure the Senator from

Idaho has had the same experience—that in the last analysis—after President Johnson's announcement in 1964—we should permit an election in South Vietnam to let the people themselves decide their destiny. That is, after all, what we are fighting for. Those who were opposed to our involvement could readily understand that. I have said that the North Vietnamese would not permit an election—that Ho Chi Minh would not permit an election.

But it appeared that there would be an election, a free election, in South Vietnam. We made that commitment publicly. We said we would permit a free election, and all people could participate. Whether they wanted communism, or neutralism, or a junta, or whatever leadership they wanted, the people of South Vietnam could decide for themselves. That argument is gone now, as the election nears the Saigon junta has ruled out “neutralists,” has ruled out “Communists,” has ruled out others of whom the generals disapproved; and now they will not even let those who are left participate freely and openly.

If there is no free election, I do not know what can be said if someone asks, “What are you doing in South Vietnam?” What can one possibly argue? What is the remaining argument that can be made for what we are doing there?

One point to which we committed ourselves publicly—the President of the United States and the American Government—is that we would let the people decide for themselves. Here is an opportunity to do so, and the people are not being permitted to decide for themselves. The junta which we are supporting militarily and economically is not permitting them to decide.

Where is our whole moral position in that part of the world? Without a free election, I do not believe it is there any longer, and I believe that, under those circumstances, a reassessment of the entire situation is obviously required. If the Saigon regime is not going to cooperate so that the people can decide what they want, what is our position in Vietnam? I think it will be destroyed.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Under the order previously entered, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] is recognized for a period not to exceed 20 minutes.

**ABM**  
THE PROPOSED NIKE X ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM IN DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL SHOULD BE REJECTED OR THIS APPROPRIATION BILL DEFEATED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Department of Defense appropriation bill, which will be fully debated in the Senate next week, provides for \$730 million for the Nike X antiballistic missile system of defense. Together with unexpended funds for this purpose, the total amount available to be spent on this system in fiscal year 1968 totals approximately \$970 million. This would be

S11382

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- SENATE

August 11, 1967

an indefensible expenditure. It would result in an utter waste of taxpayers' money, just as all of the millions heretofore spent on the deployment of antiballistic missile systems ringing some cities of our Nation have been fruitless and wasteful.

Negotiations have been proceeding between the United States and the Soviet Union seeking to eliminate the deployment of antiballistic missile systems. These should proceed for at least another year. I support the views of Secretary of Defense McNamara that our offensive power makes it an unnecessary and wasteful action to expand the Nike X antiballistic missile system or any other similar system at this time. This would be a stupid and indefensible waste of public money.

Mr. President, this proposed appropriation is only the beginning of what could become the greatest waste of taxpayers' money in the history of the country. Furthermore, after construction it would cost between \$4 billion and \$5 billion a year to maintain.

Even a first step to protect our Minutemen missile sites and to a lesser degree 10 American cities would cost at least between \$3 billion and \$4 billion, with the likelihood that this would be doubled by operational costs. Secretary McNamara has made it clear that this would merely be a down payment on a price tag that would eventually be at least \$40 billion. From research that I have made on this subject, I am convinced that the total price tag would eventually come closer to \$60 billion or \$70 billion, and even those figures are considered conservative by some experts. The proposed ABM system can readily become the largest and most expensive "pork barrel" project of all time.

In testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense McNamara stated:

There is no system or combination of systems within presently available technology which would permit the deployment now of an antiballistic missile defense capable of giving us any reasonable hope of keeping U.S. fatalities below some tens of millions in a major Soviet nuclear attack on our cities.

Secretary McNamara has presented estimates of the ability of such a system to reduce American casualties in the event of a nuclear war. He estimates that, in the absence of an ABM system, the United States would suffer 100 to 125 million fatalities if the Soviet Union were to strike first, and 90 to 95 million if the United States were to strike first. He estimates that if we deployed an antiballistic missile system and the Russians merely maintain their present offensive capability without responding to the new situation, the dreaded nuclear exchange would still kill between 20 million and 40 million Americans. If the Russians chose to respond by increasing their offensive armaments, ultimately American fatalities could mount to 120 million.

Mr. President, what kind of protection is this? Also, officials in the Pentagon talk of protecting 50 of our larger cities. Which 50? What of the hundreds of mil-

lions of Americans who live in the unprotected remainder of our Nation? In effect, we are playing a macabre numbers game which offers neither our Nation nor the Soviet Union any real protection whatever. The construction of an antiballistic missile system in reality represents a kind of maginot line—an imagined security. No such system can be more than fractionally effective, and its deployment would represent a waste of billions of dollars, with no added security to either side.

Not only would such an action be unwise from a military and economic point of view, but it could also have grave political implications. By plunging ahead with the deployment of a relatively primitive ABM missile system, we run the risk of escalating the arms race to a fantastically high and unbelievably costly plateau. One more upward spiral of the arms race would probably leave both sides with no more real security than each has now.

After we both have antiballistic missile systems, we may rest assured that the race will then start all over again to produce new, more expensive and more sophisticated missiles that can penetrate the antimissile systems. After another costly race is over, there is every reason to believe that the balance of power will settle at the same point where it now rests. Neither our Nation nor the Soviet Union will be any safer. Each will have managed to maintain a stalemate only by the expenditure of vast sums of money that might have been put to more constructive use.

When the balance of military strength is stabilized on that new plane, so expensively purchased, the world, far from being safer, will be more insecure than ever. After the expenditures of billions of dollars, the two super powers will have achieved nothing constructive. As a matter of fact, should confidence in these defensive missile systems become excessive, the effect may even hasten the hour of ultimate thermonuclear destruction by infusing policymakers of both nations with an unwarranted assurance, the frailty of which will be fatally demonstrated in the first moments of battle.

Mr. President, our only real defense is to keep our offensive power so far ahead of the Russian defense that it will remain perfectly clear to the Soviet leadership that a first strike against us will trigger an unbearable response. We must constantly seek to improve our offensive missiles now standing in concrete silos and underwater in our Polaris submarines. We now maintain a 3 or 4-to-1 advantage over the Soviet Union in the number of strategic missiles we possess, but even this does not fully measure the advantage enjoyed by our Nation. Soviet missiles threaten our land-base ICBM force, but they cannot threaten our large and highly effective Polaris force which is based on submarines and is invulnerable to attack.

Above everything else we maintain 41 Polaris submarines, each carrying 16 missiles with nuclear warheads. These submarines are capable of remaining under the water for a period as long as 300 days and nights. There are two complete

crews trained and available for every Polaris submarine. The latest of these submarines, the *Will Rogers*, was launched and successfully fired missiles but a few weeks back.

These missiles, which approximate in number 700, have a maximum range of approximately 2,875 land miles. This is the capability of the most modern of these Polaris submarines. Earlier models have a range of approximately 1,370 land miles. They are capable of firing missiles with nuclear warheads from under the ocean, and, of course, no area within the vast land mass of Communist China or the rest of Asia or Europe and the entire area of the Soviet Union is safe from devastation by missiles fired from these submarines.

With all this tremendous power, it would be wasteful and foolhardy on our part to vote this appropriation containing provisions for an antiballistic defense at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, and which will be just the beginning of what will become the biggest billion dollar boondoggle of all time.

Mr. President, what nuclear power is threatening the peace of the world now? There is not one, unless someone wishes to claim that Albania is offering a threat, or Communist China, which has a crude nuclear capacity, but which will not have the capacity to make a nuclear attack on us with intercontinental ballistic missiles before 1975 at the earliest.

Our tremendous nuclear capability is far superior to that of the present nuclear capability of the Soviet Union. In addition to our tremendous airpower we maintain on the ocean and under the ocean the most powerful Navy capable of offensive action and destruction of the enemy that has ever been known. Admittedly, our intercontinental ballistic missile power with nuclear warheads exceeds that of the Soviet Union on the basis of 3 to 1.

The Soviet Union is the only nation in the world having even the capability of attacking the United States with intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Soviet Union is no longer a "have not" nation. It is a "have" nation. There was a time in that grim cold war period following the end of World War II when the dictator of the Soviet Union, Stalin, offered a threat to the peace and safety of the world. Stalin is no longer the ruler of the Soviet Union. Today, the Soviet Union is veering toward capitalism and co-existence.

The present leadership is evincing cooperation toward us instead of threatening annihilation. The Soviet Union is no longer the menace it once was to the peace of the world. Its leaders are interested in expanding and improving the lives of its citizens. It is really unthinkable that there would be any nuclear conflict between us.

Mr. President, another interesting possibility is that the rulers of the Kremlin are probably not yet at that point where they would publicly state that the few antiballistic missile sites which they have constructed and intend to construct are being built to protect their nation against future Chinese nuclear weapons. The Chinese threat as a nuclear power is

August 11, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 11383

minimal today, and will not be a threat to us for many years to come. However, because of the proximity of China and the Soviet Union, Red China will be a threat to the Soviet Union long before it endangers our Nation. The country which will first feel the shadow of the Chinese nuclear power is the Soviet Union.

In this connection, as I have said before in this Chamber, our distinguished former colleague from Arizona, Barry Goldwater, in the course of his 1964 campaign for the Presidency, made some wise statements, when we look back on them. Perhaps one of the wisest was when he said:

I predict that if within 10 years from now there should be a war between Communist China and the United States, the Soviet Union will be fighting on the side of the United States as an ally and as a comrade in arms.

Mr. President, this proposed antiballistic missile experiment will encourage additional waste of taxpayers' money on the civil defense boondoggle which has to date cost taxpayers more than \$1.5 billion. No man, woman, or child in the United States is any safer today, because over the years these bureaucrats of the Department of Defense, in the so-called Civil Defense Division, have squandered all this money. The only result of which has been to give some politicians in States and cities and in the Federal Government high-salaried positions while they render no service whatsoever to the defense of our country.

The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that a ballistic missile defense system must be accompanied by a complete fallout shelter program. Those favoring a massive fallout civil defense shelter building program have estimated that such a system, to be at all effective, would cost American taxpayers anywhere from \$20 billion to \$302 billion. Not millions of dollars—billions of dollars.

Even then, the experts say there is no guarantee that any fallout shelter program would be at all effective in saving lives.

To embark now upon a project of such dubious value, at such fantastic expense, against the advice of the Secretary of Defense, and at a time when we are pleading with other nations against any further expenditures for such armaments, makes no sense whatever and should be rejected.

Mr. President, a blind determination simply to acquire more nuclear hardware than the Russians falls far short of being the kind of statesmanship the Nation needs.

After 20 years of the nuclear arms race, the conclusion should be obvious that the only defense, the only protection, against missile attack is making sure that it never happens. A new race for "defensive" weapons would do nothing to advance that cause. There is every reason to believe the contrary. The present situation in which the Soviet Union has the power to destroy us and we have the power to destroy them, even after absorbing a first strike, is far from ideal. However, it is surely better than the new

and highly unstable situation that would be created by escalating the scale of overkill another notch.

President Johnson has indicated that the leaders of the Soviet Union have shown interest in negotiating for an agreement whereby neither nation will embark on the construction of antiballistic missile systems. Let us hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will show a degree of restraint which would make it clear that they are doing only the minimum necessary to insure themselves against any possible threat from Communist China, and thereby avoid a fantastic escalation of the armament race. There is reason to believe that this can be accomplished if we do not act hastily in committing ourselves to a project of such immense proportions.

We should continue to seek an understanding with the Soviet Union whereby neither side would expand its defensive facilities beyond their present level. Such an understanding would freeze the strategic situation roughly as it is today with each side depending on its offensive missiles to provide the deterrent.

No inspection would be needed for such an agreement since we are clearly maintaining a continuous surveillance of the Soviet Union, and they could not deploy a system costing upward of \$30 billion without our being aware of it.

Mr. President, in the great nuclear poker game being played by the world's only two real nuclear powers, the stakes are becoming increasingly higher. Powerful forces are exerting and will continue to exert tremendous pressures on the administration and Congress to proceed with the construction of an antiballistic missile system. The power of big defense contractors to influence the ABM decision is great. A recent advertisement by an investment analysis firm was entitled "Nike X: \$30 billion for whom?" It listed 28 companies with large defense contracts that "could profit handsomely" if a full-scale ABM system were to be installed. In an article published in the New Republic, Fred Collins broke this down to show that companies on the list have 300 plants in 42 States and 172 congressional districts, with a minimum of 1 million employees. Even a political novice can readily see that this adds up to a great deal of potential political influence and pressure, particularly if a recession should slow employment.

Mr. President, it would be tragic were this to become a political issue and were reason to give way to the heated emotions of partisan politics. Decisions made this year and next regarding our commitment to an antiballistic missile system, however small at first, will influence the lives of all Americans for generations to come. To negotiate a commonsense agreement with the Russians is a far more hopeful course for saving our civilization than embarking on another round of cold war escalation.

Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that the decision as to whether to proceed with an antiballistic missile system is too momentous a question to leave to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, officials of

the Defense Department and other members of the military-industrial complex. There must be full and free discussion in the Congress and in the public media. The American people must know the facts before a decision of this magnitude is made by the militarists.

The recommendation made last week by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, that a blue ribbon commission be established by the President to provide a careful and objective evaluation of what course we should follow in this area, is the most constructive suggestion made to date. I hope that the President will accept it and establish this commission without delay. Until much further consideration has been given this matter, it would be not only wasteful but foolhardy for us to appropriate 1 cent of taxpayers' money for this purpose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Ohio for the splendid speech he has made.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, he has heard practically the same testimony that I have heard as a member of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask the Senator whether, having listened to that testimony carefully, as I know he has, he does not agree with me that it is perfectly clear the Russian antiballistic missile system is just no good. We can penetrate it any time we wish. We could destroy Moscow tomorrow, despite their so-called tallin ABM system. And, conversely, our antiballistic missile system is no good.

They could destroy us by a concentrated attack in strength. We might knock down the first missile and have a chance of knocking down the second, but the third, fourth, and fifth would get through.

In my opinion, to spend this money is absolute folly, and I strongly object to the comments made in the report of the Committee on Appropriations—which, incidentally, does not have any particular expertise with respect to an antiballistic missile system—which advises that it is the sense of Congress that this system should be deployed. It is not the sense of this Senator, and I take it that it is not the sense of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. I am happy that he and I are in complete agreement on this subject. Both of us have studied the entire matter very intensely.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## TROOPS TO VIETNAM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, is the Johnson administration blind to the signs of

growing public unrest about Vietnam? Is it deaf to the cautionary advice of Members of Congress?

It would seem so, for once again the President has decided to enlarge the American commitment there without offering any justification whatsoever to Congress or the American people.

Tucked into his tax message was the stark announcement that he had decided to authorize an increase of at least 45,000 in the number of men to be sent to Vietnam this fiscal year.

In consequence, he warned, defense spending may rise by as much as \$4 billion over the amount we are asked to provide in the defense appropriation bill now pending in the Senate.

Congress will be billed, in short, after the additional troops are on their way and we are faced with an accomplished fact.

The credibility of the administration's Vietnam policy wears thinner by the day. On July 26, for example, when Secretary McNamara appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, I asked him what consideration was being given to the proposal by Senator Cooper and others, including myself, that the bombing of North Vietnam be confined, in essence, to stopping infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam.

The Secretary replied that he could not discuss future military operations, which was no answer at all. Yet, according to the Evans-Novak column of August 4, Mr. McNamara came away from a recent briefing in Saigon "highly impressed with new evidence strongly indicating that the bombing is paying its own way, despite political fallout back home and around the world."

If so, why did he not say as much when the bombing question was raised by me in our committee? The answer, I fear, is that the lack of candor displayed by the President on the troop question has become a way of life in this administration.

During the weeks of speculation that preceded the President's announcement, I took the position that, unless there is a clear demonstration by our defense experts of an overriding military necessity, we should avoid the introduction of additional American forces in Vietnam beyond those already scheduled.

This conclusion is based on my conviction, shared by many of the best informed persons with whom I have consulted both here and in Southeast Asia, that the war in Vietnam will never be won if we attempt to do for the South Vietnamese those things which only they can do for themselves.

I do not pretend to know the right number of American troops that should be in Vietnam. I do know, however, that the scope of our present involvement is such that this has already become too much of an American war. The addition of more of our troops is bound to negate still further our efforts to help establish an independent and viable political and social structure in South Vietnam.

Progress toward that goal has been minimal, and the tactics of the country's military leaders in the current election

campaign do not inspire confidence that a significant change for the better can be expected soon. This makes incongruous, at the very least, the commitment now to send more Americans.

In announcing his decision, the President said:

This nation has taken a solemn pledge that its sons and brothers engaged in the conflict there shall never lack all the help, all the arms, and all the equipment essential for their mission and for their very lives.

Of course, Mr. President. But the statement is meaningless, because it begs the real issue. There is no question of denying support to our troops. The real issue concerns the nature of their mission and whether more Americans are the means to its accomplishment.

If the President is unwilling or unable to put the justification for his decision to the test of congressional scrutiny, he leaves us with no alternatives but to rubberstamp the accomplished fact or to repudiate him by refusing to pay the bill.

This, to me, is an intolerable position in which to place the Congress of the United States, and I urge the President to reconsider the matter before it is too late.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this has been a notable morning. The speech of the senior Senator from New Jersey is the third one on the subject of Vietnam—although his speech brings before the Senate additional and significant issues.

I want to commend the Senator from New Jersey for his forthright speech. I know that the Senator has supported all funds and measures which would provide for the security of our troops in Vietnam.

I have done so, and, whatever decisions are made, at least that I can anticipate, I intend to continue to support our men who fight in Vietnam and our country. But I agree with the Senator in his opinion, an opinion which I know has been strengthened by his recent trip to Vietnam, that our expressed purpose for being engaged in Vietnam will not be achieved for the South Vietnamese people except through their efforts, unless they win their war themselves, win it through their own military efforts and win it in their determination to decide upon their own course politically and socially.

Like the Senator, I do not have the competence from a military viewpoint to comment upon the decision to send additional forces to Vietnam. From a military viewpoint, it may be the proper course to send additional troops there. Our military men, military advisers, have the duty to do the best possible to attain their mission; and their mission is a military mission. I can understand their request. Their concern, the concern of the President, our concern is for the safety of our fighting men. However, when it comes to the point of whether or not such a course will tend to bring the war to a close, it becomes more than a military

question; it becomes a political question. It becomes a question in which we have a responsibility. I do not believe the course of continued escalation will bring the war toward negotiation and its close.

It has been over 2 years since the bombing started in 1965. The United States then had 20,000 or 30,000 men in Vietnam. Infiltration into South Vietnam from North Vietnam was not of great volume. Today 460,000 men are in Vietnam and 45,000 more are to be sent. Yet, the Defense Minister of South Vietnam is reported to have said that the bombing will not stop infiltration, unless the routes from Cambodia and Laos are closed.

The reason I have made a proposal, in which I have been joined and supported by the Senator from New Jersey, is that we try the course which has been the consistent requirement of the North Vietnamese, the unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. At least, we would know whether North Vietnam is sincere, and whether it would result in negotiations.

I congratulate the Senator on a very thoughtful speech.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky. There is no man whom I would rather have in agreement with me on matters of great consequences than him. His voice in the Senate on this matter and on all matters of great consequence has been extraordinarily valuable both on the side of wisdom and on the side of conscience. To have this agreement on a question is the most satisfying and most comforting kind of assurance that one is on the right track.

I am especially glad that he has emphasized the point that the civilian side of this Government must make the broad decisions as to our objectives in this conflict or in any other great matter of foreign policy. Our concern here is not to usurp the President's authority, to interfere with any proper role he assumes in matters of foreign policy, or domestic policy for that matter, but it is to assume the proper role of the Congress and its responsibility, which, if we are not constantly on the alert, we will find constantly deteriorating until this body is no longer able to perform the function which the Constitution requires us to perform.

I therefore thank the Senator from Kentucky for his warm and generous comments. I am happy indeed to be associated with him in this venture.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator from New Jersey a moment ago made the statement that he fears that the war in Vietnam is becoming too much of an American war. The Senator from Virginia shares that fear. It has been my view for some time that the war is becoming Americanized. In that connection, I thought it might be appropriate to read into the Record a statement of the casualties for the 7-month period from January through July.

The total U.S. casualties were 43,000. The total South Vietnamese casualties were 24,000.